

Prediction for $\Gamma(H \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-)/\Gamma(H \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)$ from Non-Abelian Flavor Symmetry

Paul H. Frampton* and Shinya Matsuzaki†

Department of Physics and Astronomy, UNC-Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA.

Abstract

It is shown that the ratio of branching ratios in Higgs boson decay $r = \Gamma(H \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-)/\Gamma(H \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)$ in a simplified $(T' \times Z_2)$ model is $(r)_{T' \times Z_2} \simeq 0.001$. This prediction is on a footing with the successful one in (s, d) mixing, $\tan 2\Theta_{12} = \frac{1}{3}(\sqrt{2})$. This value for r differs from that of the minimal standard model by a very large factor (over 250,000) and can provide a smoking gun for $(T' \times Z_2)$ flavor symmetry.

*frampton@physics.unc.edu

†synya@physics.unc.edu

Unification is a common thread in theoretical physics. One example is field theory which is used in an acceleratedly expanding number of areas ranging from particle physics where it had its first application to nuclear physics, cosmology and condensed matter physics among others.

In particle physics, the minimal standard model (MSM) is a field theory for quarks and leptons which is phenomenologically very successful yet has two aspects which display lack of a what might be reasonably expected unification.

The more obvious of the two is that there are independent gauge coupling constants corresponding to the factor groups $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ which may be labeled as g_3, g_2, g_1 . Although electromagnetic and weak interactions are partially unified in the $SU(2) \times U(1)$ electroweak theory, there are two couplings g_2, g_1 which are unrelated until the electroweak mixing angle θ_{EW} is specified. The value of θ_{EW} is empirical input.

This lack of unification of coupling constants was addressed by grand unified theories (GUTs). The simplest GUT is based on $SU(5)$ [1] and envisages a GUT energy scale orders of magnitude higher than the electroweak scale ($M_{GUT} \simeq 10^{16}$ GeV compared to $M_{EW} \simeq 10^2$ GeV) and a "desert" without new physics between these two scales. The first support for GUT came from its capability to suggest relationships between quarks and leptons. For example [2] it was pointed out that the GUT scale prediction $m_b = m_\tau$ is renormalized to $m_b \simeq 3m_\tau$ at low energy, in reasonable agreement with experiment.

An $SU(5)$ GUT made other important predictions including for θ_{EW} and the proton decay lifetime τ_p . The value $\sin \theta_{EW} = 3/8$ at the GUT scale is renormalized at low energy to a value unacceptably smaller than the measured value. Proton decay has not been seen and the lower bound on τ_p is some orders of magnitude higher than the $SU(5)$ prediction. The acceptable value for m_b/m_τ must regrettable now be regarded as fortuitous because the other predictions fail. The $SU(5)$ predictions for θ_{EW} and τ_p can be corrected by *ad hoc* modification [3] of the theory but this accommodates arbitrary values rather than leading to a predictive theory.

Grand unification received a new lease of life with the introduction of supersymmetry (Susy). The generalization of GUTs to supersymmetry (SusyGUTs) can accommodate both acceptable θ_{EW} and τ_p ; so low energy SUSY may show up at the L.H.C.

The reasons for optimism about discovery of supersymmetry at the TeV scale are balanced by the fact that the three key advantages of low-energy SUSY – (i) cancellation of quadratic divergences in the MSM (its original motivation); (ii) improved unification in SusyGUTs compared to GUTs; (iii) an attractive dark matter candidate, the neutralino as WIMP – can equally be achieved without SUSY, for example, using conformality [4] which leads to different solutions of the same issues.

The second of the two lacks of unification in the standard model is a concern already alluded to, the unity of leptons and quarks. Except for the quark-lepton correspondence in the three families in that there are doublets $(t, b), (c, s), (u, d)$ quarks and $(\nu_\tau, \tau), (\nu_\mu, \mu), (\nu_e, e)$ leptons, there is no established relationship between quarks and leptons. This is a striking fact.

Therefore we study an alternative to grand unification. Instead of the attempt to unify couplings by *e.g.*

$$(SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)) \subset G_{GUT} \quad (1)$$

we entertain a flavor symmetry

$$(SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)) \text{ and } G_{Flavor} \quad (2)$$

where G_{Flavor} is spontaneously broken at a TeV scale. The idea is that behavior under G_{Flavor} will lead from the group theory to novel relationships between quarks and leptons.

What is the best choice for G_{Flavor} ? Generally an infinite Lie group for G_{Flavor} would be expected to be gauged (otherwise it will not be respected by gravity) and this leads to additional gauge bosons effectively extending the MSM gauge group in Eq.(2). But with G_{Flavor} necessarily not commuting with the other factors because particles which have the same 3-2-1 quantum numbers will transform differently under G_{Flavor} this cannot be of the GUT form in Eq.(1). The peculiar way of writing “and” in Eq.(2) reflects that G_{Flavor} will be an overarching broken global symmetry aimed only to relate the parameters in the MSM.

Finite groups are either Abelian or non-Abelian. The Abelian varieties have irreps which are all one-dimensional and therefore insufficiently structured for fruitful model building.

On the other hand, *all* non-Abelian finite groups (with doublet, triplet, etc. irreps) have been presented up to order $g \leq 31$ in [5]. There are exactly 45 such groups. The choice of G_{Flavor} can be narrowed by the fact that experimental data [6] on the neutrino mixing angles give values $\theta_{12} \simeq 34^\circ$, $\theta_{23} \simeq 45^\circ$ and $\theta_{13} < 13^\circ$ leading [7] to the tribimaximal mixing (TBM) ansatz $\tan \theta_{12} = 1/\sqrt{2}$, $\theta_{23} = 45^\circ$ and $\theta_{13} = 0$. Such a TBM may be underwritten [8] by a leptonic flavor symmetry $G_{Flavor} = A_4$.

Extension of A_4 itself to quarks in Eq.(2) is problematic. The basic reason is that the neutrinos have Majorana masses while quarks have Dirac masses. Nevertheless, there is available the double cover T' of A_4 which is a subgroup of $SU(2)$: $T' \subset SU(2)$ as A_4 is a subgroup of $SO(3)$: $A_4 \subset SO(3)$. This leads to the adoption of $G_{Flavor} = (T' \times Z_2)$ as in [9] where the extra Z_2 is necessary, just like R-symmetry in Susy models, to exclude phenomenologically unacceptable Yukawa couplings.

The use of $(T' \times Z_2)$ already led to one successful prediction for the Cabibbo angle, in [9] where the calculations were made more tractable in a simplified model where the b quark is stable. This is a reasonable approximation to reality because the quark mixings satisfy $\Theta_{12} \gg \Theta_{23} \gg \Theta_{13}$. Thus the corrections, as confirmed by further calculation ^{#3} are small. The prediction of Θ_{12} arises because of a messenger scalar linking the three neutrinos $(\nu_\tau, \nu_\mu, \nu_e)_L$ to the D-type quarks of the first two generations which are accommodated in $Q_L(2_1, +1) [(c, s)_L, (u, d)_L]$ and $\mathcal{S}_R(2_2, +1) [(s, d)_R]$.

Before embellishing this simplified model, we here draw attention to a striking prediction it contains which, if confirmed by experiment, would provide encouragement to this direction.

We recall the general features of the model. The leptons are assigned under $(T' \times Z_2)$ as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \left(\begin{array}{c} \nu_\tau \\ \tau^- \end{array} \right)_L \\ \left(\begin{array}{c} \nu_\mu \\ \mu^- \end{array} \right)_L \\ \left(\begin{array}{c} \nu_e \\ e^- \end{array} \right)_L \end{array} \right\} L_L(3, +1) \quad \begin{array}{cc} \tau_R^- (1_1, -1) & N_R^{(1)} (1_1, +1) \\ \mu_R^- (1_2, -1) & N_R^{(2)} (1_2, +1) \\ e_R^- (1_3, -1) & N_R^{(3)} (1_3, +1), \end{array} \quad (3)$$

Imposing renormalizability on the lepton lagrangian allows as nontrivial terms only Majorana mass terms and Yukawa couplings to T' Higgs scalars ^{#4} $H_3(3, +1)$ and $H'_3(3, -1)$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_Y^{(leptons)} = & \frac{1}{2} M_1 N_R^{(1)} N_R^{(1)} + M_{23} N_R^{(2)} N_R^{(3)} \\ & + \left\{ Y_1 \left(L_L N_R^{(1)} H_3 \right) + Y_2 \left(L_L N_R^{(2)} H_3 \right) + Y_3 \left(L_L N_R^{(3)} H_3 \right) \right. \\ & \left. + Y_\tau (L_L \tau_R H'_3) + Y_\mu (L_L \mu_R H'_3) + Y_e (L_L e_R H'_3) \right\} + \text{h.c.} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Charged lepton masses arise from the vacuum expectation value (hereafter VEV)

$$\langle H'_3 \rangle = \left(\frac{m_\tau}{Y_\tau}, \frac{m_\mu}{Y_\mu}, \frac{m_e}{Y_e} \right) = (M_\tau, M_\mu, M_e), \quad (5)$$

where $M_i \equiv m_i/Y_i$ ($i = \tau, \mu, e$).

Neutrino masses and mixings come from the see-saw mechanism and the VEV

$$\langle H_3 \rangle = V(1, -2, 1). \quad (6)$$

^{#3}work in progress.

^{#4}All scalars are doublets under electroweak $SU(2)$.

Left-handed quark doublets $(t, b)_L, (c, d)_L, (u, d)_L$ are assigned under $(T' \times Z_2)$ to

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \begin{pmatrix} t \\ b \end{pmatrix}_L \\ \begin{pmatrix} c \\ s \end{pmatrix}_L \\ \begin{pmatrix} u \\ d \end{pmatrix}_L \end{array} \right\} Q_L \quad \begin{array}{l} (\mathbf{1}_1, +1) \\ (\mathbf{2}_1, +1), \end{array} \quad (7)$$

and the six right-handed quarks as

$$\begin{array}{l} t_R \\ b_R \\ \left. \begin{array}{l} c_R \\ u_R \end{array} \right\} \mathcal{C}_R \\ \left. \begin{array}{l} s_R \\ d_R \end{array} \right\} \mathcal{S}_R \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{l} (\mathbf{1}_1, +1) \\ (\mathbf{1}_2, -1) \\ (\mathbf{2}_3, -1) \\ (\mathbf{2}_2, +1). \end{array} \quad (8)$$

Two scalars $H_{1_1}(1_1, +1)$ and $H_{1_3}(1_3, -1)$ with VEVs

$$\langle H_{1_1} \rangle = m_t/Y_t, \quad \langle H_{1_3} \rangle = m_b/Y_b, \quad (9)$$

provide the (t, b) masses.

The allowed quark Yukawa and mass terms are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_Y^{(quarks)} = & Y_t(\{Q_L\}_{1_1}\{t_R\}_{1_1}H_{1_1}) \\ & + Y_b(\{Q_L\}_{1_1}\{b_R\}_{1_2}H_{1_3}) \\ & + Y_C(\{Q_L\}_{2_1}\{C_R\}_{2_3}H'_3) \\ & + Y_S(\{Q_L\}_{2_1}\{S_R\}_{2_2}H_3) \\ & + \text{h.c.} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The precise forms of the couplings in Eqs.(4,10) led to the prediction for the Cabibbo angle

$$\tan 2\Theta_{12} = \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} \right) \quad (11)$$

The same couplings lead to an even more remarkable prediction when we study the messenger scalar linking the charged leptons $(\tau, \mu, e)_L$ to the U-type quarks contained in Q_L and $\mathcal{C}_R(2_3, -1) [(c, u)_R]$. This gives rise to an expression for the ratio of branching ratios for Higgs decay

$$r = \left(\frac{\Gamma(H \longrightarrow \tau^+ \tau^-)}{\Gamma(H \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)} \right) \quad (12)$$

We recall that in the minimal standard model the two body decays in Eq.(12) satisfy at tree level

$$(r)_{SM} = \left(\frac{m_\tau^2(1 - 4(m_\tau^2/M_H^2))^{3/2}}{m_\mu^2(1 - 4(m_\mu^2/M_H^2))^{3/2}} \right) \simeq 280 \quad (13)$$

In the $(T' \times Z_2)$ model the messenger scalar $H'_3(3, -1)$ which couples both to neutrinos and to U-type quarks in the first two generations provides a large change from Eq.(13). From Eq.(4), we readily calculate the branching ratio in the $(T' \times Z_2)$ model to arrive at

$$\left(\frac{m_\tau^2(1 - 4(m_\tau^2/M_H^2))^{3/2}}{m_\mu^2(1 - 4(m_\mu^2/M_H^2))^{3/2}} \right) \left(\frac{M_\mu^2}{M_\tau^2} \right) \quad (14)$$

where $M_{\tau,\mu}$ are defined in Eq.(5), and hence

$$\left| \frac{Y_\tau}{Y_\mu} \right|^2 = \left(\frac{m_\tau^2}{m_\mu^2} \right) \left| \frac{M_\mu}{M_\tau} \right|^2 \quad (15)$$

In the expression Eq.(14) the dependence on the mixing angles, which can arise from diagonalizing the Higgs sector, cancels between the numerator and denominator. It is crucial to note that the messenger field $H'_3(3, -1)$ couples to the up-type quarks of the first two generations with the resultant masses

$$|m_u| = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} |M_\mu|, \quad |m_c| = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} |M_\tau| \quad (16)$$

so that we reach

$$(r)_{T'} = \left(\frac{m_\tau^2(1 - 4(m_\tau^2/M_H^2))^{3/2}}{m_\mu^2(1 - 4(m_\mu^2/M_H^2))^{3/2}} \right) \left(\frac{m_u^2}{m_c^2} \right) \simeq 0.001 \quad (17)$$

The change in r from the minimal standard model to T' flavor symmetry is more than a factor 250,000!!!

The derivation of the result, Eq.(17), follows from the couplings of the scalar H'_3 in Eqs.(4,10) which require that the relevant component in the T' -decomposition of the Higgs scalar couples to (u, τ) and (c, μ) masses respectively. This is predicated by the group structure of the $(T' \times Z_2)$ model with a consequent prediction extremely different from the standard model where the Higgs coupling is proportional to mass.

Since the Higgs boson and its decay branching ratios are targets of opportunity for the L.H.C., Eq.(17) can provide a smoking gun for such a quark-lepton relationship arising from $(T' \times Z_2)$ flavor symmetry.

We may ask about the predictions for the separate numerator and denominator in Eq.(12). Further study reveals that only the ration r is firmly predicted because the separate decay modes depend on the precise identification of the light Higgs doublet among the scalars of the $(T' \times Z_2)$ model. In the ratio r , however, this uncertainty cancels out.

The prediction, Eq.(17), arises from an alternative to grand unification which is a flavor symmetry with sufficient structure to relate leptons and quarks.

It will be amusing to see from experimental data about Higgs boson decays whether Nature chooses such a broken symmetry in relating quarks and leptons.

The unity of quarks and leptons was a principal goal of grand unified theories and led to the prediction of proton decay as well as expectations for neutrino masses and the electroweak mixing angle. The central idea was to subsume the established gauge symmetry into a larger simple symmetry group as in Eq.(1).

The alternative to grand unification, with the same goal of relating leptons and quarks, is the use of a global finite Non-Abelian flavor symmetry such as the $(T' \times Z_2)$ espoused here.

We have seen that a striking prediction concerns the leptonic decays of the Higgs boson. In the standard model the couplings of the Higgs to fermion pairs goes like the fermion mass and the two-body decay rates $H \longrightarrow f\bar{f}$ go like $\Gamma(H \longrightarrow f\bar{f}) \propto m_f^2$ up to small phase space corrections. The Non-Abelian flavor symmetry further constrains the Higgs coupling and strikingly changes the ratios of Higgs decay fractions so that $\tau^+\tau^-$ relative to $\mu^+\mu^-$ is suppressed by a ratio of quark masses $(m_u/m_c)^2 \simeq 4 \times 10^{-6}$.

If such an effect is observed, and it would seem difficult to miss once the Higgs boson is discovered, it will provide strong evidence, a smoking gun, for this alternative to grand unification.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by U.S. Department of Energy grant number DE-FG02-06ER41418.

References

- [1] H.Georgi and S.L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. Lett. **32**, 438 (1974).
- [2] A.J. Buras, J.R. Ellis, M.K. Gaillard and D.V. Nanopoulos, Nucl. Phys. **B135**, 66 (1978).
- [3] P.H. Frampton and S.L. Glashow, Phys. Lett. **B131**, 340 (1983).
- [4] P.H. Frampton and T.W. Kephart, Phys. Reports. **454**, 203 (2008). [arXiv:0706.1186 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [5] P.H. Frampton and T.W. Kephart, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A10**, 4689 (1995). [hep-ph/9409330](#).
- [6] Particle Data Group, Phys. Lett. **B667**, 1 (2008).
- [7] P.F. Harrison, D.H. Perkins and W.G. Scott, Phys. Lett. **B350**, 167 (2002). [hep-ph/0202074](#).
- [8] E. Ma and G. Rajasekaran, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 113012 (2001). [hep-ph/0106291](#)
- [9] P.H. Frampton, T.W. Kephart and S. Matsuzaki. Phys. Rev. **D78**, 073004 (2008). [arXiv:0807.4713 \[hep-ph\]](#).